Law Offices of Natan Epstein Attorney Docket: DE063

Date of Facsimile Transmission: 12/13/05

In the Drawings. Please replace Fig. 7 of the drawings with the enclosed corrected Fig 7 on the enclosed substitute sheet where numeral 18 has been replaced by numeral 28.

REMARKS

In the Drawings

In response to the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.82(a), the rear compartment 16 is shown in Figures 4 and 5 as the space between middle wall 38 of the fixture housing, bottom 42 and back panel 44, as also explained at page 6, lines 7 and 8 of the Specification. These three elements define a longitudinal trough which is concave in cross section, as shown in Figure 4, and is upwardly facing in relation to the downwardly facing housing top 14, both of which are part of a single extrusion 40, as explained at page 6, lines 10-19 of the Specification. As further explained at the same page, lines 20-23, the rear compartment 16 has an open top which is closed by a removable top cover 46, also seen in Figure 4. Thus, in the absence of the top cover 46, the rear compartment maybe be described as being concave and upwardly facing, and this feature is shown in Figures 4 and 6 of the drawings as originally filed with the application. For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the original drawings show the claimed feature and the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

In the Specification

Submitted herewith is an amendment to the Specification including a replacement paragraph in response to the objection to duplicate use of numeral 114 in the disclosure.

Law Offices of Natan Epstein Attorney Docket: DE063 Date of Facsimile Transmission: 12/13/05

Claim Objections

As to claim 2, the term "released condition" and the term "open condition" are intended to designate to distinct states of the window panel 28. Figure 5 of the drawings shows window panel 28 in the "closed condition" which is the normal position of the window panel during normal operation of the light fixture. Figure 4 shows window panel 28 in the "released condition" which is achieved by pressing upwardly on the underside of the window panel 28 against the leaf spring 78 as suggested by arrow A in the figure, and pulling the window panel in a forward direction as suggested by arrow B in the same figure. The "released condition" is an intermediate state of the window panel between the closed condition of Figure 5 and the "open condition" shown in Figure 6. While in the closed condition, the front of the window panel is supported by engagement of pins 60 (shown in Figure 3) in detent slots 64. By pressing along arrow A pins 60 are lifted out of the detent slots allowing the window panel to be advanced along arrow B to the "released condition" in which the pins 60 are clear of the detent slots 64 and are free to drop away along with the front 28a of the window panel by pivoting as suggested by the curved arrow in Figure 6 to an open condition admitting access to the lamp sockets 24 and light bulbs B as shown in Figure 3.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 2 is respectfully respected for the foregoing reasons.

Claim 34 has been amended to obviate the objected to language.

In Claim 4: amendment has been made to claim 4 to remove the improper dependency.

Law Offices of Natan Epstein Attorney Docket: DE063 ี ค7

Date of Facsimile Transmission: 12/13/05

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5, 18, 28; 30-32, 41 and 43, including independent Claims 1, 28 and 41, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 202(b) as anticipated by Wedell et al.

Responsive to the rejection, independent Claim 1 has been amended to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Specifically, the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1 to specify that the window panel of the light fixture is slidable between a closed condition and a released condition, and pivotable between a released condition and an open condition for access to the lamp sockets. The claim further specifies that the window panel is supported against pivotable movement in its closed condition. That is, a three step mode of operation is claimed, as was explained in detail above and which is distinct from the Wedell et al. reference which provides a hinged lower housing which supports a lens and is pivotable between an open and a latched closed condition, a two step process without any sliding movement to free the lens from its closed condition and place it into a pivotable condition.

Dependent Claim 18, dependent on claim 1, has been also amended to specify that the fixture housing is an extrusion of substantially constant cross section between the opposite ends of the housing, thereby distinguishing over Wedell et al. in particular and the cited art in general.

Independent Claim 28 has been amended to specify that the housing is formed as a unitary extrusion of substantially constant cross section between opposite ends and that the wiring compartment and housing top both extend from one to the other of the opposite ends. No such structure is found in the prior art.

Law Offices of Natan Epstein Attorney Docket: DE063
Date of Facsimile Transmission: 12/13/05

PAGE

08

Independent Claim 41 is now amended to recite that the housing top and the rear compartment are both of substantially equal length between opposite housing ends and that the rear compartment has a bottom integral with the extruded housing, thereby distinguishing over Wendell et all where the pivotable bottom closes both the rear wiring compartment and the front lamp compartment of that fixture.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103a

Claims 6, 21-25, 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a as unpatentable over Wedell et al. Claim 6 as now amended is allowable for reasons stated in connection with Claim 1. Claims 21- 25 and 29 are allowable with their respective newly amended base and intervening claims.

Claims 7-9 and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a as unpatentable over Wedell et al. v Lowell et al. are now allowable with their respective base claims as amended.

Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a as unpatentable over Wedell et al. v Gampee et al. has been amended to specify that the spring arrangement serves the dual function of maintaining one or more ventilation slots and also keeping the window panel in a detent operative for holding the panel against sliding towards the released condition of that panel.

Claims 19, 20, 37 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a as unpatentable over Wedell et al. v Eagan are now allowable with their respective base claims as amended.

Law Offices of Natan Epstein Attorney Docket: DE063

PAGE 09

Date of Facsimile Transmission: 12/13/05

Claims 27 and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a as unpatentable over Wedell et al. v

Eagan and further v Guritz are now allowable with their respective base claims as amended.

Claims 11-17, 26, 33-36 and 44 have been indicated to be allowable in the Office Action.

Claim 11 has been amended into independent form and is believed to be allowable as

such in that it now incorporates the elements of Claim 1 and 4. Claims 12-17 are allowable as

dependent on claim 11.

Claim 26 has been amended into independent form and now incorporates the major

elements of Claim 1. As so amended Claim 26 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 33 and 34 have been amended into independent form by incorporation of the

elements of Claim 28 and are believed to be allowable as such. Claims 35 and 36 are allowable

as dependent on base claims 33 and 34.

Claim 44 is allowable with base claim 41.

Claims 45-53 stand allowed.

Newly Added Claims 54-67

Claims 54 through 67 have been newly added and are believed to be allowable for

reasons already stated above in connection with the previously pending claims.

3102352446

Law Offices of Natan Epstein Attorney Docket: DE063 Date of Facsimile Transmission: 12/13/05

Conclusion

All claims in the application are now believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Natar Epstein, Esq. Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 28,997 Tel. (310) 312-2900

Fax (310) 312-2909